



Vol. I.]

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1801.

[No. 30]

Sales by Auction.

On THURSDAY,

The 15th inst. at 10 o'clock, will be sold at our Auction Room,

Malaga Wine in pipes,

French Brandy in do.
Sugar in barrels,
Bacon in lots,
Seal Leather in lots,
Soap in boxes,
Nails in casks.

Together with a variety of
DRY GOODS,

Among which are
Broadcloths, kerseys, coatings, swansdowns, plains, duffels, flannels, Irish linsens, hammings, German and British of naburgs, chintzes, calicoes, jaconet, book and tamboured muslins, and a number of other articles.

HENRY & THOS. MOORE,
Auctioneers.

January 7.

FIRST NOTICE.

Whereas a Commission of Bankruptcy is awarded and issued forth against Elisha Cullen Dick of the town of Alexandria, and he being declared bankrupt is hereby required to surrender himself to the commissioners in the said commission named, or the major part of them, on the seventeenth day of this month, at twelve o'clock in the forenoon, at the Washington tavern, in Alexandria, and make a full discovery and disclosure of his estate and effects; when and where the creditors of the said Elisha Cullen Dick, either in his separate capacity or as one of the late house of James Mease M'Rea and Company, may attend, prepared to prove their debts. At the second sitting of the commissioners, the said bankrupt is to go through his second examination; and at the last sitting the said bankrupt is required to finish his examination, and the creditors aforesaid to choose assignees, of which subsequent sitting due notice will be given and the creditors are to assent or dissent from the allowance of his certificate. All persons indebted to the said bankrupt, or who have any of his effects, are not to pay or deliver the same, but to whom the commissioners shall appoint, but to give notice to

HENRY MOORE,
Clerk to the Commission.

January 9, 1801.

NOTICE.

All persons having claims against the estate of the late THOMAS PORTER, are requested to bring them forward on or before the first of March next, and those indebted to him are respectfully requested to make payment to

SARAH PORTER, Adm'r.

Jan. (2)00

Congress of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 7.

The house again resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the JUDICIARY BILL, Mr. Morris in the chair.

A considerable number of amendments were offered by Mr. Harper, and approved.

Mr. Dennis moved an addition to one of the sections, in the form of a proviso, declaring that nothing contained in the act should be so construed as to repeal so much of an act for securing duties on stills, &c. as vests in the courts of the several states a jurisdiction in certain cases therein mentioned.

He made this motion, not with any reference to his own decision, but to try the sense of the committee on the constitutionality of the power thus delegated; which on a former day, had been contested by a gentleman from New-York (Mr. Bird.)

He had himself no doubt of the constitutionality of the power. Under our present system of government, as well as under the confederation, it had been exercised in analogous cases. The old congress had expressly vested in the state courts the jurisdiction over admiralty cases.

The constitution has empowered congress to establish judicatories, which might be made the sole organs of decision in certain specified cases; but it had not prescribed that they should absolutely be the exclusive organs. He recollected that in the convention of Virginia, that ratified the federal constitution, the advocates of it urged, as an argument for its adoption, that though congress had the right of establishing independent judicatories, it was not probable that they would extensively exercise the right; but that they would devolve judicial powers on the state tribunals.

As to the expediency of delegating judicial powers to the state courts, it presented a more difficult enquiry. It was certainly a kind of clumsy affair. Under all other governments the judicial authority was at least co-extensive with the legislative; and in many governments it went beyond it in a decision on cases under the law of nations.

Besides Mr. Dennis discerned no way of compelling state judges to perform their duty; and there appeared to be peculiar hardships in obliging courts and juries supported by particular counties to perform federal duties.

Mr. Harper had as little doubt of the constitutionality as he had of the expediency of this delegation of power. At present we are not under the necessity of establishing a judicial system as extensive as the powers of congress. If we were constitutionally obliged to do this, we should be compelled to cover the whole ground, and to institute a great number of new courts.

It is true, that we cannot enforce on the state courts, as a matter of duty, a performance of the acts we confide to them; but we give them the power, and until they refuse to exercise it, we have no cause to complain.

He did not believe this proviso necessary. But some gentlemen thought it was necessary, he would vote for it.

Mr. Bird declared himself still of opinion, that the delegation of judicial power to the state courts was unconstitutional. This is denied by the gentleman from Maryland. The argument he makes use of stands thus: He denies the unconstitutionality of the transfer, because we have practiced it; therefore we have the power. Is this correct reasoning? Does the practice of a particular thing demonstrate it to be right?

The extreme difficulty of stretching out judicial power in federal tribunals, which was alledged, was not a question of right but of expediency. If it were a question of right, then must the question of right, as superior, supersede the minor question of expediency.

Some gentlemen seemed to think, that as soon as Congress pass a particular law there exists a right and duty in the state courts to execute it. But our own practice destroys this idea; for all our laws on the subject actually give power to the state courts; the expression is, they may have jurisdiction in certain cases.

It had been asked, whether the laws of the U. States did not bind the state judges. He answered, that they bound them as citizens, but not as judges. Even the gentleman from South-Carolina admits that there is no obligation imposed upon them to act. This furnished a strong argument of the inconsistency of gentlemen, as the judges were neither bound to execute our laws, nor punishable for omitting to execute them.

Further, the institution of a judiciary co-extensive with the other branches of the government, was essential to the due administration of all just plans of civil policy. On the judiciary depended the fair administration of justice. It was an organ of essential use and necessity. It should be attached to the system of which it formed a part, independently of all other systems. As well might the organ of one human body expect to derive support from the organ of another disconnected body, as the federal judiciary expect to gain support from state tribunals. So thought the framers of the constitution; and a cotemporaneous commentator on it has declared that a judiciary co-extensive with the legislature is so natural as not to require argument to support it.

Mr. Bird then went over the same ground with that taken by him in a former debate, to which we refer the reader.

He concluded by declaring that until the point was better cleared of constitutional objections, all arguments of expediency were vain.

Mr. Nott said, the simple question was whether the Congress of the U. States had or had not the constitutional right of transferring to the state judiciaries the power of trying causes arising under the constitution or laws of the United States. In discussing this question he should not consider the consequences resulting from the decision, for although the consequences might be as his colleague (Mr. Harper) had represented that the judiciary of the United States must be made co-extensive with the state judiciaries, if this power was not admitted, yet if so the constitution was written, so it must be understood. The constitution could not be bent as convenience might require. The decision therefore must be made by the instrument itself.

The constitution provided that the judicial power of the United States should be vested in one supreme court and such inferior courts as the congress might from time to time ordain and establish; and also that they should hold their offices during good behaviour, &c.—Mr. N. said the clause in the constitution requiring inferior courts was equally imperative with that requiring a supreme court, with this difference only that the supreme court was limited to one but the details of the inferior courts were left to congress. The expression, inferior courts was a technical expression, as well understood by every lawyer as any in our law books—It meant a court possessed of subordinate powers within the same judiciary system, and necessarily implied a superior court capable of controlling an undue exercise of those powers—that the state legislatures might with much propriety be called inferior to the federal legislature, or the executive of any state be called a subordinate officer of the President of the United States, as the state courts could be considered inferior courts of the United States.

The words in the constitution were—"such inferior courts as Congress may ordain and establish;" and it was not sufficient to say that by giving power to try causes arising under the constitution, &c. you *quo ad hoc* made them courts of the United States; for there was an essential difference between ordaining and establishing courts and transferring power to courts already ordained and established. The obvious meaning of the constitution was that the judicial power of the United States should be confided to courts established and organized by their own government. Besides, Mr. Nott observed, it was required that the judges should hold their offices during good behaviour;—but this was not the case in the several states; in some, he said, they held their commissions for a limited time; in others during the pleasure of the legislature, and in others they could not hold them after a certain period of life.

There was another objection, he said, to this mode of appointing officers of the

ided that the President should appoint all the officers of the United States, not otherwise appointed by the constitution, except Congress should by law provide otherwise, as mentioned in the same clause of the constitution. The judges were not, however, of that description of officers contemplated by the constitution, the appointment of whom Congress might vest in some other department, and if they were, that power had never yet been exercised by Congress. This in effect would be to divest the President of the power given him by the constitution of appointing all officers, and to exercise it ourselves.

The doctrine he contended for would be further obviated by a reference to the second section of the third article of the constitution, expressing the cases to which the judicial power of the United States should extend.—"The judicial power shall extend in all cases, in law and equity, arising under the constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more states, between a state and citizen of another state, between citizens of different states, between citizens of the same state, claiming lands under grants of different states, and between a state and a citizen thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.

"In all cases, affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a state shall be a party, the supreme court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the supreme court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations, as the Congress shall make."

He said there was a marked difference between the words of the constitution relating to the catalogue of cases enumerated in the first part of that section, and those of the latter part of the same. The word *all* was prefixed to each of the cases first mentioned, down to the words *admiralty and maritime jurisdiction* inclusive, but was omitted in all the subsequent cases. He could see no reason why that word was added in the former part of the section, and omitted in the latter, except it meant that there was no case of the former description to which the judicial power of the United States should not extend, in fact that the courts of the United States should have exclusive jurisdiction of all those cases, and in the latter their jurisdiction should be concurrent with the State courts.

It was further to be observed, he said, that the first description of cases here enumerated, were such as had received their birth from the constitution and laws of the United States, and could not have existed previous to the establishment of the government, or be such as immediately involved the rights and interests of the general government; but that the latter were such as the individual states might have jurisdiction of, previous to that period. He presumed the state courts were not vested with more power under the present constitution than they were before, unless given them by the constitution; nor are they divested of any, unless by

the same instrument, or by Congress, in pursuance of the power therein given to them. And he had seen no part of the constitution that delegated this power to the state courts, or that authorized Congress to do it. It appeared to him that the meaning of the constitution, was to give to the courts of the United States exclusive jurisdiction over cases arising under the constitution, or laws of the United States, and also, over all cases immediately affecting the general interests, and to reserve to the individual states, the exclusive jurisdiction over their own local concerns; and that in cases involving their own interest and the rights of others, they might have concurrent jurisdiction.

It was acknowledged by the gentleman from Delaware, (Mr. Bayard) that Congress had no power to compel the state courts to perform that duty, but that the judges of the several states were bound to obey all the acts of Congress. Other gentlemen had observed, that this doctrine would go to deny that the stamp act, or any similar act, was binding on the state judiciaries. On this Mr. N. observed, that the state courts were bound to observe all the constitutional laws of Congress. When therefore Congress passed a law, that no instrument of writing for the payment of money should be received in any state court as evidence of such debt, unless the same was upon stamped paper, the judges were bound to obey it; but if they should pass a law giving power to any county court within the United States, to try persons guilty of treason against the United States, that law would not be obligatory upon them; nevertheless it would be an act of Congress. Mr. N. said, the distinction was between cases arising under the constitution and laws of the United States, and those that did not. His idea might be further illustrated by the act above mentioned (the stamp act). If a person should give a note of hand for an hundred dollars on unstamped paper, with a view of evading that act, he was liable to a penalty; that would of course be a case arising under a law of the United States, and would be exclusively cognizable in the courts of the United States. But an action brought on a note of hand written on stamped paper, is not a case arising under the law of the United States, but arises from the contract itself; and although no note had been given, the contract would nevertheless have existed. The stamp act does not require a contract to be in writing; but if people will have their contracts tested by written evidence, it requires that paper should be stamped.

Mr. N. said, wherever a duty was imposed by law, the person who was guilty of the non-performance of that duty incurred the penalty annexed, and that penalty could be recovered no other way but by indictment unless otherwise expressly provided by the law itself. And how would gentlemen frame an indictment in a state court, to embrace a case that had occurred under a law of the United States. It was essential in every indictment, to lay the offence to have been committed against the law of the state, and to conclude against the peace and dignity of the same. But surely gentlemen would not contend that an offence against a law of the United States was an offence against the law of an individual state, or against its peace and dignity. The gentleman from Delaware (Mr. Bayard) had observed that penalties incurred

under the revenue laws were not considered as crimes, but were recoverable in actions of debt. But, said Mr. Nott, merely changing the action or the mode of recovering the penalty cannot alter the nature of the offence, nor the tribunal before whom it is to be tried. It was still a case arising under a law of the United States, and although a debt, it was one in which the defendant not even in contemplation of law had any agency. And to contend that because a penalty is by an act of Congress recoverable by an action of debt, therefore they have a right to transfer these cases to the state courts for adjudication, is to say that Congress may first give themselves power to delegate it, and then exercise the power that is acquired.

But said Mr. N. if it is true that Congress have a right to impose this duty on the judges of the state courts, they must have the right to compel a performance of it. It was incompatible with the idea of sovereignty, to pass laws and not have the power and the means of carrying them into execution.

Upon the whole, he had seen no part of the constitution that authorized Congress to delegate such power to the state courts, or that authorized the state courts to execute it, and he should therefore vote against the proposed amendment.

Mr. Bayard considered the question of the delegation of power as altogether misapplied. The proviso moved by the gentleman from Maryland related to the jurisdiction of the state courts, not over offences, but over civil suits which were brought by the United States for debts arising out of contracts with the individuals indebted to the government. Now, it would puzzle him to say why the state courts should not decide cases in which the United States were a party, as well as in any other description of cases, when it was known that their jurisdiction extended over all actions for debt.

Mr. Nicholas desired to know whether there did exist other laws than the one embraced by this proviso, to which it would be proper to extend its provisions; for which purpose he moved that the committee rise.

Motion lost—Ayes 34—Noes 37.

Mr. Bird, wishing an amendment to the bill that would fairly and fully meet the question of constitutionality, recommended to the gentleman from Maryland to withdraw his proviso; in which case he would, at a proper period, present an amendment to that effect. Mr. Dennis withdrew his motion.

The chairman then read the 13th section, one clause of which is as follows: "The circuit courts shall have cognizance of all actions, or suits, matters or things cognizable by the judicial authority of the United States, under and by virtue of the constitution thereof, where the matter in dispute shall amount to— hundred dollars, and where original jurisdiction is not given by the constitution of the United States to the supreme court thereof, or exclusive jurisdiction by this act to the courts of admiralty hereby established."

Mr. Nicholas moved to fill the blank with 500, so as to confine the jurisdiction to debts above 500 dollars. Among other reasons assigned by him, he stated that the estate of Lord Fairfax, with the quit rents due thereon, had been confiscated during the revolution by the state of Virginia; notwithstanding the confiscation,

the heirs of Lord Fairfax had sold all their rights (which the assignees contended remained unimpaired) it might be their wish to prosecute in a federal court, expecting to gain advantages in it which could not be had from the courts of Virginia. His object was to defeat this purpose by limiting the jurisdiction of the circuit courts to sums beyond the amount of quit rents, alleged to be due by an individual.

[We understand that the present assignees of the claims of Lord Fairfax are General Marshall, General Lee, and a third individual, and that they maintain their claims under the British treaty.]

The motion was opposed by Messrs. Harper and Bayard.

On the question being taken, it was lost by the casting vote of the chairman—Ayes 37, Noes 37.

The blank was then filled up with 400—Ayes 41.

Charge of the Judge of the Court of Vice-Admiralty, in the case of the American brigantine Leopard, captain Ropes.

The proof of property adduced, is completely satisfactory, and the only pain for the consideration of the court is how the case stands affected on principles of law. In the recent case of the *Essex*, (which was an American vessel wholly laden with goods, the produce of and purchased in Spain, and captured on her voyage to a Spanish colony, having previously called in at a port on the continent of America, where the cargo was unladen and immediately re-shipped, and which was determined against the claimant on the ground that the asserted destination was falsified, that touching in America was to color the true purpose, and that it was virtually, a traffic between Spain and Cuba) I expressed some repugnance to decide otherwise than had been invariably the practice in this court, without some authority more specified, than it was in possession of, in cases where the vessel in which Spanish productions were forwarded, was not the same with that in which they had been imported, and still more where there had been a bona fide transfer in the neutral country.

The present is a case of this description; the wines have been, (without landing them) shipped from the vessel importing to another, and the Iron has been sold by the original importer from Spain, to its present proprietor. Under these circumstances, the court feels itself happy in being relieved from all its doubts, by a case in the second number of the admiralty reports (received only within a few days.) It is the case of the *Emanuel*, a Danish vessel employed in the coasting trade of Spain, and in discussing the law on this subject, Sir William Scott lays down such principles as fully to authorize me, in my apprehension of them, to consider the present traffic as coming fully within their range. I am thereby informed, that to step into the aid of a depressed enemy, by taking up a trade which peculiarly belongs to himself, and to extinguish which is one of the principal objects and proposed fruits of victory, is a departure from the strictest duties imposed by a neutral character, and that it is by a new act and by an interposition, neither known nor permitted by that enemy, in the ordinary state of his affairs, to give a direct opposition to the efforts of the conqueror, and to take off that pressure which it is the very purpose of war to inflict, in order to compel the conqueror to a due sense and observance of justice.

their
re-
with
to
be
ob-
ing
to
al.
ill-
are
third
their
effra.
was
an-
400
Vice-
rican
cor.
n for
the
law.
which
with
ed in
to a
called
erica,
medi-
min.
that
the true
traf-
refsed
than
this
speci-
cates
educ-
fame
port-
een a
try.
tion;
oding
ng to
by the
pre-
cum-
n be-
a case
y re-
ays,
anish
le of
in this
such
may
the
their
at to
y, by
longa
s one
fruits
frict-
after,
an in-
mitted
te of
on to
take
pur-
com-
ber-

That the colonial trade is of this de-
scription is well-known, and that the Spa-
nish colonial trade is guarded by a mono-
poly in time of peace, in the strictest sense
of the word, there needs no other proof
than the edict of the king of Spain, and
tho' it has been frequently asserted that
neutrals were admitted to import negroes
into some particular ports during peace,
yet not under the abuses that may hence
have arisen, can this licence be taken out
of the description of a mere indulgence, a
temporary relaxation of the colonial sys-
tem, much less can it be construed into a
permission to import the productions and
manufactures of Spain.

I have in fact, never heard it pretended
that even the venal indulgence of the co-
lonial administrators ever extended the
concession beyond productions strictly A-
merican. Viewing then, the colonial
trade as a trade not usually open to foreign
vessels, I am bound to declare, that to
convey the commodities of an extensive
empire [Spain] from the parts where they
grew and are manufactured, to other parts
(the colonies) where they are wanted for
use, is to afford the most effective accom-
modation that can be given by a neutral
to a belligerent; even more so I may add,
than in undertaking the coasting trade for
him, inasmuch as in the colonial trade there
is an importation of what is new, and the
enemy cannot have recourse to the alterna-
tive which is in his power in the other,
that of transporting his production within
land. The case put by Sir Wm. Scott to
the coasting trade, had actually occurred
in the Spanish colonial trade, the British
navy has a decided ascendant; all Spanish
communication between the mother coun-
try and the colonies, may be truly said to
be cut off, and therefore in applying to this
what has been observed of the other, that
for neutrals to interfere in this trade, is
giving an opposition to the success of Bri-
tish hostility, as direct and effectual, as to
be only short of an actual military assist-
ance; I must decide, that to carry the pro-
ductions of Spain to her colonies directly
or indirectly, is an un-neutral act, and
that such productions found on their way
thither, are liable to forfeiture, and the
carrier to the loss of his freight. I am
fully aware that it may be said that the
force of the arguments used in the decree
of the Emanuel, might warrant the court
to go farther, and to pronounce, all traffic
with the colonies illegal. To this I can
only reply, that I do not wish for the pre-
sent to go beyond the letter of it, and that
in assigning this limit in the application of
the law of the coasting trade to the colo-
nial, I may be further justified by the in-
dulgence shewn to the exportation of na-
tive commodities, in other cases more
strong than the present, I direct the vessel
and articles, of American growth or ma-
nufacture to be restored. I condemn the
wine and iron to the use of the captors,
the same being productions of the Spanish
territory in Europe, and bound to the
transatlantic parts of that empire.

(Signed) JOHN KENSALL,
J. C. V. A.

October 20, 1800.

Nassau, Register's Office, C. V. A.

Dec. 5, 1800.

I do hereby certify the above to be a
true copy of the decretal order of the bri-
gantine Leopard, captured by his majesty's
ship Meleager, and the private vessel of
war, Hero, pronounced on the return of
commission for further proof in case of the
said brigantine Leopard.

P. BROWN, Reg. C. V. A.

Alexandria Advertiser.

WEDNESDAY, January 14.

*There was no Mail North
of the City received at the
Post-Office this morning.*

We are informed that the bill for ex-
tending the Charter of the Bank of Alex-
andria, has been rejected in the House of
Delegates by a majority of two.

JOHN JAY, Esq. declines the acceptance
of the office of Chief Justice of the Unit-
ed States.

Town Meeting.

AT a meeting of the citizens of Alex-
andria, at the Court House, on the 13th
of January 1801, held in pursuance of a
notice given by the committee chosen to
confer on the subject of general regulations
for the Territory of Columbia, ELISHA
C. DICK, was appointed Chairman, and
Henry Moore Secretary.

The committee having submitted a se-
ries of opinions (which were committed to
writing) for the consideration of their fel-
low-citizens, they were read.—It was sug-
gested, that as the subject involved many
of the most important interests of the peo-
ple of the district, and as the meeting was
not sufficiently numerous to furnish a cor-
rect expression of the general sentiment,
that it would be advisable to postpone the
discussion of it till another meeting. It
was proposed therefore, and agreed to, that
the inhabitants of that part of the district
remaining as yet within the jurisdiction of
Virginia, be requested to assemble at the
Court House at Alexandria, on FRIDAY
next, at 5 o'clock in the evening.—It was
further proposed and agreed to unanimou-
ly, that the contents of the paper furnished
by the committee, be in the mean time
published for consideration. The same
are subjoined accordingly.

E. C. DICK, Chairman.

HENRY MOORE, Secretary.

Solicitous for the welfare and advance-
ment of the territory of Columbia, and
deeply interested in its local concerns, we
view, with apprehensive sensibility, the
arrival of that period which calls for the
deliberation of Congress, on the propriety
of assuming the exercise of that exclusive
legislation over the district, which is vest-
ed in them by the constitution of the U-
nited States.

The subject is novel in the science of
government—it is momentous to those
whose lives, liberty, and property are im-
plicated in the issue.

However fully satisfied we may be,
that Congress possess the constitutional
power of exercising a jurisdiction over this
district to the entire exclusion and annihi-
lation of the state authorities and laws;
nevertheless we will not dissemble that se-
rious and weighty objections present them-
selves against the immediate assumption of
powers to that extent.

We believe that Congress may exercise
a legitimate jurisdiction of the district to
any extent; whether partial or general,
simultaneous or exclusive, accordingly as
experience or necessity may dictate. A
general and exclusive legislation on the
part of Congress will completely annul the
laws and jurisdiction of the respective
states. But, if it comports with the pre-
sent convenience of the federal govern-

ment, certain particular subjects of legisla-
tion may be assumed, without impach-
ing the general sovereignty and jurisdic-
tion of the states. The effect of the ex-
clusive assumption therefore would be to
annihilate our subsisting union with the re-
spective states, and effectually to divest us
of those political rights, which, as compo-
nent parts of independent states we before
enjoyed. We shall then be deprived of all
weight in the legislative councils of the na-
tion; we can possess no share in the choice
of our executive chief magistrate, from
whom all the superior officers, military,
judiciary, and consular of the United
States derive their appointments. We
shall thus be completely disfranchised in
respect to the national government, while
we retain no security of participating in
the formation even of the most minute lo-
cal regulations by which we are to be af-
fected. We shall be reduced to that de-
precatd condition of which we patheti-
cally complained in our charges against
Great-Britain, of being taxed without a
representation.

Our elective rights, that munition of
civil liberty, and impregnable barrier a-
gainst tyranny, being radically demolish-
ed, not a semblance of responsibility is at-
tached to those who enact laws for our go-
vernment. We have not even the ordi-
nary motive of self-interest to controul
our legislators, which pervades every other
quarter of the United States, and many
operate powerfully on the conduct of the
representative, when he feels that he must
partake, in common with his constituents,
of the benefits or evils resulting from those
measures to which he gives his sanction.
For, in the present case, not a man of
those who are to legislate for us, is chosen
by us, or affected by the operation of those
laws which he imposes on us; because no
inhabitant of the district will be eligible
to a seat in Congress.

From an attentive survey of our existing
situation, viewed in every aspect which
it discloses, considering the various incon-
veniences and embarrassments which pro-
bably may, and the privation of important
political rights which certainly will re-
sult from an exclusive congressional jurif-
diction, we respectfully solicit Congress
to postpone the exercise of their powers to
their full extent, till imperious circum-
stances shall require it: but should Con-
gress not think fit to grant this request,
we earnestly entreat them to delay the
full assumption, till they shall have de-
vised and matured competent system
of government, and published it for the
consideration of those who are materially
interested.

The British commissioners from Ameri-
ca, says a London paper of October 20th,
were presented to his majesty last week, on
their return to England—Their negocia-
tion with America has been unsuccessful,
and we understand the expense of this es-
tablishment will now cease.

A Paris paper of the 14th of Novem-
ber, contains the following article, "It is
seriously said at Manheim, that Poland is
likely to be re-established, and that the
three powers interested in this business,
having agreed upon the principal question,
are only prevented from performing this
act of justice immediately, by their not
having yet determined what form of go-
vernment shall be given it.

The Academy of Sciences of Erlangen,
has lately proposed for discussion, several

important questions, relative to the
pox. Among others is the following
"Will the rubbing a person with
which acts as a preservative against the
plague, likewise act as a preservative
against the Small Pox?"

A young man, of good character, and
of a fine figure, proposes a lottery in *The
Bourdeaux Journal*. The conditions are
not hard: All the widows and maidens,
who have not attained the age of 32, are
invited to take of him a ticket at the price
of 25 francs. There are to be 4000 of
these tickets. Only one number is to be
drawn from the wheel, and the fortunate
holder is to gain the young man for a hus-
band, and to partake with him the 100,000
francs, produced by the lottery!

There has been presented to the French
government a plan for the improvement of
the port of Antwerp, which will be exe-
cuted as soon as a general peace shall have
secured the liberty of the Scheldt. Ac-
cording to this plan, this large and com-
modious harbor, which has been blocked
up for 200 years, will be cleared out, ves-
sels of 600 tons will then be able to enter
it with ease, and an extensive commerce
will restore to Antwerp the splendor which
that city enjoyed during the fifteenth and
sixteenth centuries.

PORT OF ALEXANDRIA.

ARRIVED,

Brig Industry, M'Kenzie, Jamaica;
schooner Philip, Tupman, New-York;
—Eliza and Betsey, Howes, Boston;
—Margaret Tingey, Moore, Nor-
folk.

For Freight or Charter

To any of the Leeward West-India Islands,
The fast-sailing Brig
FAME,

Burthen seven hundred barrels,
now lying at Lawrafsen's
Wharf. For terms apply to
SHREVE & JANNEY,
or the Captain on board.

January 14.

eo



Freight wanted,

For the schooner
REGULATOR,
John Bagley, master;
Lying at colonel Ramsey's wharf, for any
port of the United States. Apply on
board.

January 13.

d3t

To be Sold,

AN excellent Mill-seat with a few a-
cres of land adjoining, situate on the Four
Mile Run, in the county of Fairfax, about
six miles from Alexandria and five from
the Federal City—it has every advantage
that can be wished for to render it agree-
able, there is 13 feet 5 inches natural fall,
with plenty of stone on the spot; also a
quarry on each side the run where it is
intended the dam shall be, so that one may
be made at an easy expense. There is but
one other situation for a mill on said run,
and that lies only about 150 yards below,
consequently must be dependant on the
above for its supply of water. I believe
there is plenty of water for an over-shot
at least ten months in the year. Timber
may likewise be had convenient at a rea-
sonable rate. The title is indisputable,
and the terms will be made known by ap-
plying on the premises, to

WILLIAM CARLIN.

December 31.

1aw3t

Shrove and Janney

have just received, per the brig Sukey and Betsey, capt. Caleb Cook, 50 pieces do Sail-Duck 23 coils do Cordage which they will sell low for cash or exchange for flour or corn. They will give Cash for white Beans and Pease.
December 16. eo

Washington Tavern.

Peter Heiskell

Acquaints his former customers and the public in general, that he has removed from Staunton and established an Inn in Alexandria.

He has a few good SADDLE and CHAIR HORSES which he will hire.
Dec. 18. 4weo

NOTICE.

THE stockholders of the Bank of Alexandria, are hereby informed, that a dividend of five per cent on the capital stock of said Bank, for the half year ending this day, is declared, and will be ready to be paid to them, or their representatives on Thursday next.

By order of the president and directors,
GURDEN CHAPIN, Cashier.
January 5. eow4

A Housekeeper wanted.

LIBERAL wages will be given to a discreet Woman, capable of managing the affairs of my family as a Housekeeper. A middle aged woman of a mild disposition and regular deportment will be preferred, as part of her attention will be necessary in superintending a nursery of young children.

CHARLES LEE.
December 13, 1800. eodtf

To Rent

And immediate possession given,
A convenient dwelling house and store, with necessary out-houses, &c. situate on Duke-street near Col. Hooe's wharf. A further description is thought unnecessary, as it is presumed any person wishing to rent, will view the premises—Apply to

CHARLES JAMIESON.
January 1. eo3tf

The Subscribers and Members of the Mutual Insurance Company against Fire on Goods and Furniture in the state of Virginia, are hereby requested to attend in person or by proxy their annual General Meeting to be held on the second Wednesday in next January, which being the fourteenth day of the said month.

W. F. AST,
Principal Agent.
Richmond, Dec. 6. (16) 4tiaw

FOR SALE,

A LOT of GROUND

On the corner of Queen and Fairfax streets, extending 123 feet 2 inches on Queen street, 45 feet 8 inches on Fairfax street: this property is liable to no incumbrance. For terms apply to Mr. John Green, Alexandria, or Mr. Hezekiah Price, Old-Town, Baltimore.

Liberal credit will be allowed for the payment.

January 2. eo18t

IMPORTED

And for sale by the subscriber at the County Wharf, a general assortment of Cologne Mill-stones, from Amsterdam, with hand Mill-stones and German steel.

JESSE HOLLINGSWORTH.
Baltimore, December 27. 2aw6t

A Small Cargo of

James River COALS,

At Fitzgerald's wharf,
To be sold on moderate terms, if applied for immediately.

Philadelphia loaf and lump sugar; hard soap by the box; also a few boxes of crown or shaving soap; hay in bundles of about two hundred weight; Flour, Bran and Shorts by the quantity.

Cash given for Wheat or Corn.

Wm. HARTSHORNE.

12 mo. 24.

eo

Notice is hereby given to the Stock-Holders of the Bank of Alexandria, that an Election will be held at the Court House in this town on the third Monday in January next, for the purpose of choosing nine Directors of said Bank, for the ensuing year, agreeably to charter.

GURDEN CHAPIN, Cashier.

Dec. 16.

d4w

Fresh Raisins and Currants

for Sale, by

Robert B. Jamieson,

Who has (as usual) a general assortment of Wines, Spirits & Groceries, viz. Jamaica and W. I. Rum, old Peach, Cogniac and Bourdeaux Brandy, Holland Geneva, Irish and Country Whiskey, a few pipes of old Bill Madeira, four do. London market do. 16 half pipes 7 year old Port, 20 quarter casks Sherry, 5 pipes Teneriffe, 4 pipes Catalonia, and a few qr. casks of Lisbon and Malaga Wines, Powder, loaf and lump Sugars, Molasses, Spanish Honey, Salt Petre, Copperas, Madder, Race and ground Ginger, Pimento, Pepper, Mace, Nutmegs, Cloves, Teas of the latest importation, Fig-Blue, Gunpowder, Patent Shot, Leper and Hamilton's Snuff in bladders and bottles, Alum, Indigo, Pearl Barley, Starch, London brown Stout and Porter in bottles, Almonds, spinning Cotton, Hunter's Pipes in kegs, Olives, Capers and Anchovies, Chocolate, Rice, Mustard, and Spanish Segars; all of which will be sold low for Cash, Country Produce, or on a time to his punctual customers.

Also, five likely, strong

KENTUCKY HORSES,

On a liberal Credit.

December 20, 1800.

d

FOR SALE,

Genuine Madeira Wine in pipes, hhds. and quarter casks, for approved notes, or exchanged for Tobacco or Flour.

I WILL SELL OR RENT

The Store I have occupied for many years past, situated on Prince-Street, opposite Col. Hooe's. No stand in Town more eligible, or better accommodations for carrying on an extensive wholesale, wet or dry good business. The cellar perfectly dry, with a door at each end, will hold one thousand barrels of flour; 2500 barrels may be stowed on the premises without any inconvenience to the occupant.

Those desirous of holding it will apply to me on Merchants' Wharf, where I shall in future do business.

Wm I. HALL.

December 22.

d

Boarding and Lodging

May be had for five or six gentlemen, by applying to

JOHN GORDON, King Street.

December 16.

eo

The Creditors of the Estate

of the late Col. BURGESS BALL, are requested to forward to Mrs. Ball a statement of their claims; as the Administrators are anxious to provide for the discharge of them as early as possible.

Loudoun, Dec. 1, 1800. (15) 7t

WANTED TO HIRE,

For the service of the Potomac Company for the ensuing year, to work at the Great-Falls,

A number of active, able bodied NEGRO MEN, for whom liberal wages will be given. They will be well fed, clothed and lodged, humanely treated, and in cases of sickness taken good care of at the expense of the Company—Their wages will be paid quarterly, and if desirable to the owners, agents will be appointed at different places to pay at the expiration of each quarter, as may be most convenient to the parties. Further particulars may be had by application to Mr. Alexander Reid, at the Great-Falls, or to the subscriber in George-Town.

By order of the President and Directors.

JOSEPH CARLETON,

Treasurer of the Potomac Company.

George-Town, Dec. 29. 3ot

An extensive and well chosen Assortment of

CALICOES & CHINTSES,

With a variety of other articles, this day received, and for Sale, by

JOHN HORSBURGH.

J. Horsburgh respectfully informs those of his customers with whom he has running accounts, that he is under the necessity of discontinuing this practice;—therefore in future he will sell for Cash or Produce only.

December 22.

d

JUST RECEIVED,

By the schooner Eliza, Capt. Ward, from New-York, and for sale by

Roberts & Griffith,

30 hhds muscovado sugar
East India sugar in bags
Loaf and lump sugar in hhds. and bbls.
Coffee in barrels and bags
Pepper and pimento
A few pipes London particular Madeira wine

Sherry, Malaga and Teneriffe wine in quarter casks
Spirits, French brandy and Holland gin
Cotton in bales

Mould and dipt candles

Raisins in kegs and boxes

Soft shell almonds, &c. &c. &c.

They daily expect by the schooner Phillip from New-York, 20 puncheons Antigua rum.

January 12.

eo3tiaw3t

GEO. CLEMENTSON

Has this day opened a Store adjoining his dwelling-house, at the corner of Prince and Pitt Streets, where he now has, and intends to keep,

A general assortment of

GROCERIES,

Which he will dispose of on moderate terms, for Cash or Produce.

He has also for Sale,

A few DRY GOODS, consisting of brown Hollands, 7-4 white Shirtings, Calicoes, Leather Gloves and Mits, Threads, Writing Paper, Cutlery, Curry-Combs, Chalk-Lines, Needles, &c. and 15 kegs white Paint ground in Oil.

December 22.

eo24t

ANTHONY SAWYER,

Hair Dresser and Perfumer,
(lately from Baltimore)

Royal street, between King and Prince streets, fourth door south of the Printing Office of the Times,

Begs leave to inform the

Ladies of Alexandria, and the country generally, that having received the new est fashion of Ladies' Wigs and Fillets, he will be thankful to receive their orders for the above articles, and will warrant them equal to any manufactured on the continent.

N. B. Any Lady wishing to see his Patterns, may be accommodated by sending a servant to his shop.

He has for sale, every article in the Perfumery line, on the most reasonable terms.

Alex. Dec. 8.

d

Fresh Raisins.

Just received a few boxes of excellent Raisins, and for Sale, by

JOHN & J. TUCKER.

December 24.

eo

Marine Insurance Company of Alexandria.

THE stockholders in the Marine Insurance Company of Alexandria, are hereby notified, that an election will be held on Thursday the 15th day of January next, at the Court House in the said town, for the purpose of electing fifteen persons, citizens of this commonwealth, as directors of that institution.

J. B. NICKOLS, Sec'y.

Form of power to vote by Proxy.

I, or we do hereby nominate and empower to attend at the meeting of the subscribers to the Marine Insurance Company of Alexandria, on Thursday the 15th day of January next, then and there, for me and in my name, to vote for 15 directors of said Company.

Given under my hand this

day of

N. B. The above must be subscribed before two witnesses.

December 24.

eoqt

To be Rented,

And possession given immediately—

A two story house and garden on Duke-street, about two squares to the eastward of the stone bridge.

W. HARTSHORNE.

A number of valuable lots

in different situations, to be sold—also, a brick house in King-street, in the tenement of Thomas Cruse;—a part of the purchase money will be taken in Alexandria Bank shares at par, and for some of the lots, Alexandria Insurance shares at a price to be agreed on. For part of the purchase money of either, a liberal credit may be had 1st Month 7th.

Being provided with a complete & elegant assortment of New Materials, all manner of Printing—Book Work, Hand-bills, &c. will be executed at this Office with neatness, accuracy and dispatch.

Two active Lads, about 14 years of age, and of reputable connexions, would be taken as Apprentices at the office of the Advertiser.

PRINTED BY

S. SNOWDEN & Co.